

Title	On the Use of Some Synonymous Expressions in the West-Saxon Gospels in Relation to their Authorship
Author(s)	Kozuka, Yoshitaka
Citation	大阪大学言語文化学. 9 p.107-p.126
Issue Date	2000-03-31
oaire:version	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/78027
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

On the Use of Some Synonymous Expressions in the West-Saxon Gospels in Relation to their Authorship^{* 1)}

KOZUKA Yoshitaka^{**}

古英語訳福音書として現代まで写本が伝わっているのは、リンデイスファーン福音書(10世紀中頃成立)、ラッシュワース福音書(10世紀後半成立)、ウェストサクソン方言訳福音書(1000年頃成立)の3種である。このうち、前者の2つに関しては、翻訳者(注釈者)についての通説がある。しかしながら、ウェストサクソン方言訳福音書に関しては、翻訳者像について何もはっきりしたことはわかっていない。訳者は複数いたという説(Drake 1894 etc)と訳者は1人だったという説(Bright 1904-6)があるものの、いずれの説についても証拠は不十分で定説とはなるには至っていない。本論文は、このウェストサクソン方言訳福音書の翻訳者像の問題を、類義語の使用という観点から考察するものである。類義語の使用の分析を翻訳者像の考察の手段として用いたのは、類義語の使用には、個人差(癖や好みなど)が反映されることが多いためである。本稿で考察の対象とした類義語は、(1)「行く」という意味の動詞 *faran* と *feran*、(2)「言う」という意味の動詞 *secan* と *cweðan*、(3)「それゆえ、しかし」などの意味の接続詞的副詞 *soðlice*, *witodlice*, *eornostlice* の3組である。これらの類義語の使用について分析した結果、いずれにおいても福音書間で用法に差が見られ、特に、ヨハネ伝は他の3福音書の語法と大きく異なっていることがわかった。更に、ヨハネ伝に特異な語法は、いずれも他の福音書の語法と比べると、古い(保守的な)語法であることもわかった。以上のことから、ウェストサク

* 古英語ウェストサクソン方言訳福音書における類義語の語法—翻訳者像との関連—(小塚良孝)

** 大阪大学大学院言語文化研究科博士後期課程

¹⁾ This is a revised version of the paper read at the 16th meeting of Osaka University Society for the Study of Language and Culture, May 27, 1999. I am grateful to Professor Hideki Watanabe for his invaluable advice. I alone am responsible for any remaining errors and inaccuracies.

ソン方言訳福音書の翻訳者像について、次の2つの可能性を提起した。1つ目は、Drake (1894)が指摘するようにウェストサクソン方言訳福音書は複数の訳者の共作で、特にヨハネ伝は他の福音書の訳者と異なる人物によるものであったという可能性、2つ目は、ヨハネ伝の訳者は、語彙の点で他の訳者よりも保守的、もしくは古かった、という可能性である。

0 Introduction

There have come down to us three Old English translations of the Gospels, namely the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (c. 950), the *Rushworth Gospels* (c. 975) and the *West-Saxon Gospels* (c. 1000: hereafter referred to as WSG)²⁾. Of these three Old English Gospels, only WSG's authorship remains unknown³⁾.

It was Drake (1894) who first considered its authorship in detail. From some lexical and grammatical differences between the four Gospels, he inferred as follows:

... the authorship of the West Saxon Gospels is at least dual, and probably triple; more explicitly, that the Matthew is by one translator, the Mark and Luke by another, the John by a third (unless possibly by the translator of the Matthew) (*ibid.*: 45)

Since then, some, though not many, studies, such as Harris (1901), Frary (1929: 49-53), and Sato (1993), have presented evidence in support of Drake's inference⁴⁾.

²⁾ Grünberg (1967) claimed that Matthew was translated in the ninth century, but this assumption has not been accepted generally (cf. Skeat 1871-87, Preface to Luke: xi-xii, and Liuzza 1998: 17).

³⁾ There are generally accepted theories regarding the authorship of the two Anglian interlinear glosses to the Latin *Vulgate*. The *Lindisfarne Gospels* are believed to have been glossed by a priest called Aldred, and the *Rushworth Gospels* by two scribes, Farman and Owun (cf. Skeat 1871-87: Preface to John, viii-xv, Preface to Mark, xi-xiii, Backhouse 1981: 7-21).

As opposed to Drake (1894), Bright (1904-6: John, xxii-xxvi) insists on the 'unity of authorship' of WSG, and says:

A more minute study of the entire text may disclose such variations only as can be brought into harmony with the dominant note of unity of authorship. The translator clearly varies his manner somewhat, and in details, at times, differs from himself; but the task of the entire translation was a long one, and was probably resumed at intervals, and carried on without constant or uniform care for consistency. (*ibid.*: xxv)

Although there are, thus, two contrary opinions about the authorship of WSG, neither of them has been sufficiently established, and therefore neither can yet be accepted as credible.

Our concern in the present paper is to consider this question of the authorship of WSG⁴⁾ in regard to the use of three groups of synonyms, namely (1) *faran* and *feran*, (2) *secgan* and *cweðan*, and (3) *soðlice*, *witodlice* and *eornostlice*. The examination of how certain synonyms are used is an effective method for solving the problem of authorship, because their employment often reflects one's habit or preference.

The points we would like to examine are concerned with the following two possibilities related to the authorship of WSG: (i) John, as Drake (1894) first claimed, could have been composed by another translator than that of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and (ii) the vocabulary of the translator of John is not as modern as, or in other words, more conservative than that of the translator of the other Gospels.

⁴⁾ Frary (1929: 49-53) illustrated the difference in the use of passive constructions in the four Gospels. Sato (1993) pointed out the uniqueness of John from some stylistic and lexical points of view. Harris (1901) argued that the Latin original of WSG could be divided into, at least, three groups (1 Matthew, 2 Mark and Luke, 3 John) and inferred that there had existed three translators.

⁵⁾ The corpus examined is Corpus MS (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 140), which is considered to be the oldest MS and that standing closest to the original which is not extant (Bright 1904-6: John, xvi). All the citations of WSG are from Skeat (ed. 1871-87). All the emphases in them are mine.

1 *Faran* and *Feran*

1.1 *Faran* and *Feran* in WSG

Faran and *feran*⁶⁾ are synonyms for 'to go'. Table 1 below shows the frequency of the two verbs in each Gospel (compound verbs are also treated as *faran* and *feran*)⁷⁾:

Table 1: Frequency of *faran* and *feran* in WSG

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John	Total
<i>faran</i>	39	16	29	67	151
<i>feran</i>	56	33	66	2	157
Total	95	49	95	69	308

From Table 1, we can roughly say as follows about the distribution of *faran* and *feran* in each Gospel:

- ① In Matthew, *faran* and *feran* are evenly employed.
- ② In Mark and Luke, *feran* occurs much more than *faran*.
- ③ In John, *faran* is almost exclusively employed.

Taking their tense forms into consideration, we can detect greater differences between the four Gospels in the use of the two verbs:

⁶⁾ *Faran* is a strong verb, whose preterite stem is *for*. *Feran*, on the other hand, is a weak verb, which was derived from *for*, the preterite form of *faran* (*for* + *jan* → *feran*; Mitchell and Robinson 1992: 160).

⁷⁾ Of the compounds with *faran* or *feran* as their second element in WSG, *forðfaran* and *forðferan* are excluded from our argument because of their possible special character. See note 13 for detail on this point.

Table 2: Frequency of *faran* according to tense in WSG

	Present-Stem	Preterite-Stem
Matthew	34	5
Mark	12	4
Luke	27	2
John	39	28

Table 3: Frequency of *feran* according to tense in WSG

	Present-Stem	Preterite-Stem
Matthew		56
Mark		33
Luke		66
John		2

As shown in Table 3, *feran* appears only in the past tense in WSG. Therefore, *ferde*, the preterite form of *feran*, seems to be employed practically as a preterite form of *faran* together with *for*⁸⁾. Table 3 also indicates that *ferde* occurs quite frequently in Matthew, Mark and Luke, but hardly at all in John (only two occurrences). By contrast, as Table 2 indicates, *for*, the original preterite form of *faran*, appears many times in John, but rarely in the other Gospels.

Thus, there exists a notable difference between John and the other Gospels in the use of the two synonymous mutative verbs, *faran* and *feran*. This lexical dissimilarity is summed up as follows: In John, irrespective of forms (i.e. whether present or preterite), *faran* is preferably employed. By contrast, in the other Gospels, the use of *faran* is restricted almost completely to the forms with present stem (i.e. *fær-* or *far-*), and *ferde* is predominantly employed, instead of *for*, as its preterite form. This lexical difference, as shown in Table 4 below, reveals a great dissimilarity between John and the other Gospels in the frequency of *faran* and *feran* in the past tense:

⁸⁾ Cf. Weman (1933: 45).

Table 4: Frequency of *faran* and *feran* in the past tense in WSG

	<i>faran</i> : <i>feran</i>
Matthew	5 : 56 \div 1 : 11
Mark	4 : 33 \div 1 : 8
Luke	2 : 66 = 1 : 33
John	28 : 2 \div 1 : 0.07

This lexical contrast between John and the synoptic Gospels is clearly understood by observing their passages. Take a passage from John and Luke for example:

Luke 9:51-57

he ge-trymede hys ansyne þ he **ferde** to hierusalem ... 7 hig ne onfengon hine forþam þe he wolde **faran** to hierusalem ... 7 hig **ferdon** on oþer castel; Ða hi **ferdon** on wege. sum him to cwæð; Ic fylige þe swa hwyder swa þu **færst**;

John 7:1-10

Syþþan **for** se hælend to galilea. he nolde **faran** to iudea forþam þe þa iudéas hine sohton 7 woldon hyne ofsléan ... His broðra cwædon to him. **far** heonon 7 ga on iudea land. ... **Fare** ge to þison freols-dæge. ic ne **fare** to þison freols-dæge forþam min tid nis gyt gefylled; ... Eft þa his gebroðru **foron** þa **for** he eac to ðam freols-dæge.

It is worth noting that this contrast in the choice of *faran* and *feran* does not stem from the difference of their Latin counterparts. As Table 5 and 6 below indicate, this lexical dissimilarity between John and the other Gospels is detected even in the equivalents of the same Latin words (the numbers of the instances of *faran* and *feran* in the past tense are given in parentheses)⁹⁾:

⁹⁾ For the full list of the Latin counterparts of *faran* and *feran* in WSG, see Appendix.

Table 5: Frequency of *faran* and *feran* to translate Latin *abeo* in WSG

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
faran	2 (1)	2 (1)		15 (11)
feran	23 (23)	11 (11)	12 (12)	1 (1)

Table 6: Frequency of *faran* and *feran* to translate Latin *eo* in WSG

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
faran	19 (0)	9 (1)	16 (1)	4 (0)
feran	2 (2)		16 (16)	

Thus, John differs noticeably from the synoptic Gospels in the use of *faran* and *feran*, synonyms denoting ‘to go’. In John, *faran* is consistently preferred irrespective of tense. In Mark, Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, *faran* and *feran* are complementarily employed according to tense.

1.2 Consideration from the Diachronic Viewpoint

From the diachronic point of view, quite significant is the difference detected between John and the other three Gospels in the employment of *faran* and *feran*. Diachronically speaking, their use observed in John, that is, the marked preference for *faran* over *feran* irrespective of tense, reflects traditional word-usage in the West-Saxon dialect which had already been established in early West-Saxon. On the other hand, the complementary use of the two verbs according to tense is a relatively new word-usage, one which developed after the time of Alfred the Great (849–901) and was established in Middle English¹⁰⁾. As a result of the development of this new usage, *faran* and *feran* rivaled each other in late West-Saxon. We can observe this rivalry in West-Saxon literary works. We will see below the distributions of *faran* and *feran* in some of them. The literature examined is as follows (their abbreviated titles used in Table 7 are

¹⁰⁾ Weman (1933: 44). On the later development of *faran* and *feran*, see *OED* (s.v. *fare* v 1, *ferē* v 1).

given in parentheses): *Pastoral Care* (CP: written c. 900), the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*¹¹⁾, the prose portion of the *Paris Psalter* (Ps (P) : written c. 900), the *Royal Psalter* (Ps (D): written in the middle of the tenth century), the *Lambeth Psalter* (Ps (I): written in the first half of the eleventh century), *Apollonius of Tyre* (ApT: written c. 1000) and *Lives of Saints*¹²⁾ (ÆLS: written c. 1000).

Table 7 below shows the frequencies of the use of *faran* and *feran* in the past tense in these texts, which are arranged in loosely chronological order¹³⁾:

Table 7: Frequencies of *faran* and *feran* in the past tense in some West-Saxon texts

Date	c. 900			c. 950		c. 1000		c. 1050	
Text	ChronA (-anno 896)	CP	Ps(P)	ChronA (anno 897 -924)	Ps(D)	ApT	ÆLS	Ps(I)	ChronC (anno 982 -1066)
faran	56	6	1	47	12	9		16	39
feran	7				2	1	34	10	41

As Table 7 shows, *ferde* occurs much more frequently in the works written around and after 1000 (except *ApT*) than in the earlier works. We can say,

¹¹⁾ The corpora examined are Parker MS (*ChronA*: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 173) (from the beginning to anno 924) and Abingdon MS (*ChronC*: Cotton Tiberius B i) (from anno 982 to 1066). I have divided *ChronA* into two parts, whose boundary is anno 896, because the first half is considered to be compiled before 900 (to be more precise, in the last 30 years of ninth century) (Bately 1988: 97, 118).

¹²⁾ The chapters examined are: II, III, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXVI and XXXII.

¹³⁾ *Forðferde* and *gefor*, the preterite forms of euphemistic *forðferan* and *gefaran* denoting 'to die, pass away', occur quite frequently in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* since it has many records concerning the death of persons of high rank (such as kings and archbishops). Standing above the rivalry between *for* and *ferde*, these two words seem to have been established or have been given a special status as a word for 'died' at least in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and probably in the other corpora as well, because there occurs no instance of *forðfor* and *geferde* denoting 'died' in spite of a great number of the examples of the forms, *forðferde* and *gefor*. *Geferde* occurs five times in *ChronC* (992, 994, 1009x2, 1010), but all of them mean 'brought'. *Forðfor*, on the other hand, occurs but once in *Ps* (I) (128: 8), but it is employed as an equivalent of Latin *practereo* 'to pass'. For this possible establishment of *gefor* and *forðferde* as a word for 'died', I have excluded the euphemistic words, *forðferan*, *forðfaran* and *gefaran* from this consideration.

therefore, that on the whole the employment of *ferde* had, to a great extent, spread over the West-Saxon dialect by c. 1000. In view of such a historical background as stated above, it is quite interesting that only John, unlike the other Gospels, shows the marked preference for *for* over *ferde*, in the sense that modern and unmodern word usages are observed in one text¹⁴⁾.

2 *Cweðan* and *Secgan*

In this section, we will see the lexical differences between John and the synoptic Gospels in the use of two synonymous words denoting 'to say', *secgan* and *cweðan*. Here, too, John will show a non-modern or conservative lexical character.

According to Ogura (1981: 105), which is the most exhaustive study of the diachronic development of the reporting verbs, *quoth*, *say* and *tell* in Medieval English, there existed some clear functional and syntactic distinctions between *secgan* and *cweðan* in early OE. From late OE onward, however, these two words began to interlock both syntactically and, in particular, functionally.

In early OE, the function of introducing direct speech was almost exclusively confined to *cweðan*. *Secgan* also came to introduce direct speech in late OE; *cweðan* and *secgan* began their rivalry in late OE. According to Ogura (*ibid.*: 67), the use of *secgan* introducing direct speech suddenly increases in works written after WSG, which has many more instances of *secgan* with direct speech than do the other works¹⁵⁾. The frequencies of *secgan* with direct speech in the four Gospels are, however, quite different from one another¹⁶⁾.

¹⁴⁾ The use of *faran* in John is also quite different from the other Gospels in another respect, that is, the frequent use of *faran* as an equivalent of the Latin verb *vado* 'to go, advance'. John employs *faran* and *gan* evenly in rendering *vado*, while Matthew, Mark and Luke almost exclusively employ *gan* or *gangan*.

¹⁵⁾ Ogura (*ibid.*: 67) points out 'an extremely large number of instances of direct speech' and 'the tendency of unifying its vocabulary and expressions' as a possible cause for the sudden prevalence of *secgan* in WSG.

¹⁶⁾ Tables 8 to 10 present the results of the present author's own survey of the use of *secgan* and *cweðan* in WSG as an equivalent of the Latin *dico* and *aia*.

Table 8: Frequency of *secgan* and *cweðan* introducing direct speech in WSG¹⁷⁾

	<i>secgan</i> : <i>cweðan</i>
Matthew	42 : 306 \div 1 : 7.3
Mark	51 : 165 \div 1 : 3.2
Luke	48 : 324 \div 1 : 6.8
John	17 : 302 \div 1 : 17.8

As Table 8 indicates, direct speech is more frequently introduced by *secgan* as well as by *cweðan* in the synoptic Gospels, especially in Mark. This lexical dissimilarity is obviously reflected in the equivalents of Latin *aio*, which always occurs in the *Vulgate* as an introductory word of direct speech except in two instances (Luke 15 : 3, John 11 : 11). The mutual ratio of *secgan* and *cweðan* in each Gospel is as follows:

Table 9: Equivalents of Latin *aio* in WSG

	<i>secgan</i> : <i>cweðan</i>
Matthew	7 : 68
Mark	20 : 52
Luke	11 : 73
John	0 : 9

As Table 9 shows, John employs only *cweðan* as its equivalent, while the other three use both *cweðan* and *secgan*.

There is another difference in the use of *secgan* and *cweðan* between John and the other Gospels. In John, the introduction of direct speech is, from a statistical point of view, a peripheral use of *secgan*. In the other Gospels, on the other hand, this function is more or less its central use. Below is presented the distribution of the functions of *secgan* in each Gospel:

¹⁷⁾ A biblical cliché, *sodlice* (*soðes, to soðum etc.*) *ic secge eow* (*ðe*) + direct speech, is not regarded as an instance of *secgan* with direct speech.

Table 10: Elements taken by *secgan* as its direct object in WSG

	accusative noun / ðæt-clause (%)	direct speech (%)	others *	Total
Matthew	64 (45.7)	42 (30.0)	34	140
Mark	34 (34.0)	51 (51.0)	15	100
Luke	66 (41.8)	48 (30.4)	44	158
John	81 (73.6)	17 (15.5)	12	110

* The instances of *secgan* with no direct object are included here.

Table 10 indicates that the translator of John restricts, to a great extent, the use of *secgan* to its original function of taking an accusative noun or *ðæt*-clause as its direct object. But the new function of introducing direct speech seems to be, more or less, established as a use for *secgan* in the mind(s) of the translator(s) of the other Gospels, especially of Mark.

Thus, John significantly differs from the other Gospels in the use of the two synonymous reporting verbs, *secgan* and *cweðan*. To sum up, John is more conservative in the use of *secgan* than that in Matthew, Mark and Luke in the following two points: (i) the infrequent use of *secgan* introducing direct speech, (ii) the strict restriction of the use of *secgan* to its original function of taking an accusative noun or a *ðæt*-clause as its direct object.

3 *Soðlice*, *Witodlice* and *Eornostlice*

In this section, we will observe some differences between the four Gospels in the employment of the three conjunctive adverbs, *soðlice*, *witodlice* and *eornostlice*, by analyzing their uses from the viewpoint of translation. We shall then see that John shows a non-modern character in their uses, as well.

Some studies such as Drake (1894), Olsan (1973) and Sato (1990, 1993) have given special attention to the use of these three adverbs in WSG. Of these, Sato (1993: 340-1) and Drake (1894: 34-5) mentioned the uniqueness of John with regard to their use. Neither of them, however, has made a full investigation on

their use from the translational viewpoint¹⁸⁾.

Though these three adverbs greatly differ from one another in their original meanings¹⁹⁾, they are employed, to some extent, interchangeably in rendering many Latin conjunctions or adverbs. Below is presented a list to show their chief counterparts in the *Vulgate* (the numbers of instances are given in parentheses):

soðlice (412): *autem* 'while, but' (218), *enim* 'for, but' (91), *vere* (*verum*) 'truly' (26)
witodlice (209): *autem* (64), *enim* (35), *ergo* 'therefore' (29), *quidem* 'truly' (23)
eornostlice (25): *ergo* (25)

As shown above, from a translational viewpoint, these three adverbs partially overlap one another in meaning or function. In this sense, we can say that they are in synonymous relation. Their distributions in the four Gospels are, however, quite different from one another. In the following consideration, we will analyze the use of these three adverbs translating the Latin *autem*, *enim* and *ergo* and make clear the dissimilarity between the four Gospels in the interchangeability between the three conjunctive adverbs in rendering them.

3.1 *Autem*

Table 11: Equivalents of *autem* in WSG

	soðlice	witodlice	ða	others	no equivalent	Total
Matthew	112	38	59	22	125	356
Mark	30	1	41	4	35	111
Luke	64	1	135	19	122	341
John	12	24	14	10	135	195
Total	218	64	249	55	417	1003

¹⁸⁾ Tables 11 to 13 present the results of the investigation made by the present author.

¹⁹⁾ Etymologically speaking, *soðlice* was derived from *soð* 'sooth', *witodlice* from *witod*, the past participle of *witian* 'to decree, destine', and *eornostlice* from *eornost* 'earnest'.

As Table 11 indicates, the words mainly employed as an equivalent of Latin *autem* in WSG are *sođlice*, *witodlice* and *đa*²⁰⁾. As Drake (1894: 34-5) points out, *witodlice* appears only once as an equivalent of *autem* in Mark and Luke, where, instead of *witodlice*, *sođlice* is overwhelmingly employed. By contrast, Matthew and John employ both *sođlice* and *witodlice* frequently²¹⁾, though it is only John that prefers *witodlice* to *sođlice* as an equivalent of *autem*.

3.2 *Enim*

Table 12: Equivalents of *enim* in WSG

	sođlice	witodlice	others	no equivalent	Total
Matthew	46	22	4	43	115
Mark	27	1	6	33	67
Luke	15	1	6	36	58
John	3	11	1	46	61
Total	91	35	17	158	301

As shown in Table 12, the words mainly used in WSG to translate *enim* are *sođlice* and *witodlice*²²⁾. Their frequencies in the four Gospels, however, greatly differ from one another. In Matthew, Mark and Luke, *sođlice* is chiefly employed for the translation of *enim*. Luke and Mark, in particular, show a marked preference for *sođlice* over *witodlice*, whereas in John *witodlice* is preferred to *sođlice* as an equivalent of *enim*. It is to be noted that the frequency of *sođlice* and *witodlice* in the equivalents of *enim* is quite similar to that seen in respect to the equivalents of *autem*.

²⁰⁾ Excepting these three, *and* (or 7) occurs most frequently as an equivalent of *autem* (more than thirty times).

²¹⁾ Drake (*ibid.*: 34) says from this contrast that in Matthew and John '*witodlice* and *sođlice* had little if any difference in meaning in the minds of the translators', while in Mark and Luke 'a distinction seems evidently to have been made'. Taking their use for the translation of other words (especially, *enim* and *ergo*) into consideration, however, *sođlice* and *witodlice* seem to be distinguished in John, too.

²²⁾ The other words used for the translation of *enim* are *forðæm*, *đa*, *nu* and so on.

3.3 *Ergo*

Table 13: Equivalents of *ergo* in WSG

	eornostlice	soðlice	witodlice	ða	others	no equivalent	Total
Matthew	21	1	3		4	27	56
Mark	2	1		1		8	12
Luke	2 ²³⁾	2	5	3		26	38
John		1	21	57	3	93	175
Total	25	5	29	61	7	154	281

As is indicated in Table 13, in WSG, *ergo* is translated mainly by three words, namely *ða*, *witodlice* and *eornostlice*. Of these words, *eornostlice* for *ergo* is a word characteristic of late West-Saxon²⁴⁾. Only in John, however, is this word not employed as an equivalent of *ergo*, though *ergo* occurs most frequently in the Latin original (175 occurrences). In John, instead of *eornostlice*, conservative words like *ða* and *witodlice* are almost consistently used for the translation of *ergo*. Thus, John is distinguished by the avoidance of the relatively modern word *eornostlice* in comparison with the other Gospels, especially from Matthew, where *eornostlice* is greatly preferred to the other words.

3.4 Summary

As we have seen, each Gospel shows individual characteristics in the use of the three conjunctive adverbs, *soðlice*, *witodlice* and *eornostlice*. Of the differences illustrated above, it is most noteworthy that only John does not employ *eornostlice*, a word characteristic of late West-Saxon, but almost exclusively uses *witodlice* and *ða* in order to translate Latin *ergo*.

²³⁾ One of the two instances of *eornostlice* in Luke (3: 8) is the form of *geornlice* in all the MSS but Hatton MS. As the alteration in Hatton MS (from *geornlice* to *eornostlice*) suggests, however, this *geornlice* is probably a mistranscription, which might have been caused by the similarities in spelling and (original) meaning between the two words. Therefore this *geornlice* is regarded as *eornostlice*. According to *Bosworth-Toller* (s.v. *geornlice*), *geornlice* has no conjunctive meaning.

²⁴⁾ Gneuss (1972: 80).

4 Concluding Remarks

In the present paper, we have illustrated some notable differences between John and the other Gospels of *WSG* in the use of three sets of synonyms. Furthermore, we have also shown that the unique word-usages in John (1 to 3 below) share a distinct character, in that they are not as modern as the usage in the other Gospels; (1) the marked preference for *faran* over *feran* irrespective of tense, (2) (a) the infrequent use of *secgan* to introduce direct speech, (b) the strict restriction of the use of *secgan* to its original function of taking an accusative noun or a *ðæt*-clause as its direct object and (3) the consistent avoidance of *eornostlice* as an equivalent of Latin *ergo*. These distinctive characteristics of John lead us to two possibilities concerning the authorship of *WSG*; one is that John, as Drake (1894) first inferred, was translated by a person other than the translator(s) of Matthew, Mark and Luke. The other is that the translator's vocabulary was more or less conservative. Although the latter possibility has not been pointed out so far, it may serve as a clue to the solution of the problem of the authorship of *WSG*.

Thus, by examining only a few pairs of synonyms, we were able to get at the evident uniqueness of John. Further investigation from our viewpoint, therefore, deserves to be made. It is also necessary for our concern to attempt a comparison between *WSG* and the two Anglian versions of the Gospels to see if the latter had an influence on *WSG*, though the two antedating versions differ from *WSG* in translation type.

Appendix : Latin Counterparts of *faran* and *feran* in WSG(a) *faran*

Matthew		Mark		Luke		John		
ascendo	1x	discedo	1x	pertranseo	1x	advenio	1x	
circumeo		praecedo		praetereo		dispergo		
descendo		abeo	2x	ascendo	2x	introeo		
intro	2x	transeo	9x	descendo	4x	mitto	praetereo	
procedo		eo		16x		exeo		pergo
revertor		transeo				procedo		
abeo	2x	eo			sequor	2x		
vado		5x		venio	3x			
exeo				ambulo				
transeo	exeo			4x				
eo	19x	transeo			16x	descendo	4x	
		eo						
		ascendo		8x				
		abeo		15x				
		vado		17x				
Total	39	Total	16	Total	29	Total	67	

(b) *feran*

Matthew		Mark		Luke		John	
antecedo	1x	circumeo	1x	ambulo	1x	abeo	1x
ascendo		egredior		circumeo		exeo	
circumeo		ingredior		egredior			
intro		introeo		facio			
migro		praetereo		intro			
praecedo		secedo		introeo			
revertor		transcendo		proficiscor			
sequor		transeo		perambulo			
egredior	2x	ascendo	4x	recedo			
eo		proficiscor		regredior			
proficiscor	3x	exeo	6x	venio			
recedo		abeo	11x	profiteor	2x		
secedo	4x			secedo			
exeo	5x			transeo			
transeo	6x			ascendo	3x		
abeo	23x			discedo			
				descendo	5x		
				exeo	10x		
				abeo	12x		
				eo	16x		
Total	56	Total	33	Total	66	Total	2

Selected Bibliography

- Backhouse, J. (1981, repr. 1997) *The Lindisfarne Gospels*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Bately, J. M. (1982) "Lexical Evidence for the Authorship of the Prose Psalms in the Paris Psalter," *ASE*, 10, 69-95.
- (1988) "Old English Prose before and during the Reign of Alfred," *ASE*, 17, 93-138.
- Bosworth, J. and T. N. Toller. (1898) *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. London: Oxford UP. *Supplement* (1921) by T. N. Toller.
- Bright, J. W. (ed. 1904-6, repr. 1972) *The Gospel of Saint Matthew in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint Mark in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint Luke in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint John in West-Saxon*. 4 vols. New York: AMS.
- Bright, J. W. and R. L. Ramsay (1907) *Liber Psalmorum. The West-Saxon Psalms* (Being the Prose Portion or the 'First Fifty', of the so-called Paris Psalter). London and Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., Publishers.
- The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form: TEI-P3 Conformance Version-1998 Release*. Dictionary of Old English Project, U of Toronto, 1998. 3.5 " inch floppies.
- Drake, A. (1894) *The Authorship of the West Saxon Gospels*. Diss. Columbia College.
- Frary, L. G. (1929) *Studies in the Syntax of the Old English Passive with Special Reference to the Use of Wesan and Weorðan*. Language Dissertations 5. Baltimore: Waverly.
- Gneuss, H. (1972) "The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester," *ASE*, 1, 63-83.
- Goolden, P. (ed. 1958) *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*. London: Oxford UP.
- Grünberg, M. (1967) *The West-Saxon Gospels: A Study of the Gospel of St. Matthew with Text of the Four Gospels*. Amsterdam: Scheltema & Holkema.
- Harris, L. M. (1901) *Studies in the Anglo-Saxon Version of the Gospels, Part I: The Form of the Latin Original, and Mistaken Renderings*. Diss. Johns Hopkins U, Baltimore: John Murphy Company.
- Lindelöf, U. (ed. 1909-14) *Der Lambeth-Psalter*. Helsinki: Acta Societatis

Scientiarum Fennicæ, Tom. 35. 1.

- Liuzza, R. M. (ed. 1994) *The Old English Version of the Gospels*. Oxford: EETS.
- (1998) "Who read the Gospels in Old English?" in *Words and Works: Studies in Medieval English and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson* (Peter S. Baker and Nicholas Howe eds.), Toronto: U of Toronto P.
- Mitchell, B. and F. C. Robinson (1992, repr. 1995) *A Guide to Old English, Fifth Edition*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Ogura, M. (1981) *The Syntactic and Semantic Rivalry of Quoth, Say and Tell in Medieval English* (KUFS Publication). Tokyo: Sanseido.
- (1985) "Direct or Indirect? — *ðæt* as a Quotation Indicator," in *Philologia Anglica: Essays Presented to Professor Yoshio Terasawa on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Olsan, L. T. (1973) *The Style of the West-Saxon Gospels*. Diss. Tulane U.
- The Oxford English Dictionary (Second Edition) on Compact Disc*. 1992, London: Oxford UP.
- Patrick W. Conner (1996) *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition. vol. 10. The Abingdon Chronicle, A. D. 956-1066 (MS. C, with reference to BDE): a reconstructed edition with introduction and indices*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Plummer, C. (ed. 1892-99) *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel: with supplementary extracts from the others*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Roeder, F. (ed. 1904) *Der Altenglische Regius-Psalter*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Sato, A. (1990) "Soðlice and Witodlice: A Case of Functional Shift of Old English Adverbs," *English Linguistics*, 7, 39-55.
- (1993) "The Unique Diction in the West Saxon Gospel according to Saint John," *Studies in English Literature*, LXIX, No.2, 339-351.
- Skeat, W. W. (ed. 1871-87) *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- (ed. 1881-1900, repr. 1966) *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. 4 vols. EETS. OS. 76, 82, 94, 114.
- Sweet, H. (ed. 1871-72, repr. 1958) *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. 2 vols. EETS. OS. 45, 50.

- Tuso, J. F. (1966) *An Analysis and Glossary of Dialectal Variations in the Vocabularies of the Three Late Tenth Century Old English Texts, the Corpus, Lindisfarne, and Rushworth Gospels*. Diss. U of Arizona.
- Weman, B. (1933) *Old English Semantic Analysis and Theory with Special Reference to Verbs Denoting Locomotion*. (Lund Studies in English I.) Lund: Gleerup.